UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,441 09/28/2006		Armando Garcia Luna	3179-0102	8918
	7590 12/16/200 FIGG, ERNST & MAN	EXAMINER		
1425 K STREE		GREEN, ANTHONY J		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/16/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/599,441	GARCIA LUNA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Anthony J. Green	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed.</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.	nsideration and/or search (see NOT »);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	octed claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 <sup>-1</sup>		cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Americanient (i	10L-32+).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>10</u> would be allowal allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	ble if submitted in a separate, time		-
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>10-18</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 9-20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Anthony J. Green/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1793	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: According to applicant's arguments pozzolanic materials with a densities less than 2.4 g/cm3 have greater pozzolanic indexes (equal to or greater than 120%) as compared to pozzolanic materials with densities greater than 1.4 g/cm3 however claims 5, 6, 14 and 15 recite pozzolanic indexes that are less than 120%. Accordingly it is believed that these claims would fail to further limit claim 1. Also applicant has not shown that the product of the reference does not possess a density within the claimed range. Further unexpected results cannot overcome an anticipation rejection. Also with respect to the arguments concerning claims 19 and 20, the particle size of the instant claim is encompassed by the particle size range of the reference. Further applicant argues that the use of alkaline metal compounds and calcination at high temperatures results in the generation of alkaline metal oxides and thus result in a different product are not commensurate in scope with independent claim 19. Accordingly applicant has not adequately provided evidence that the product is different.